DURHAM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW D1500101 Duke University Central Generation Plant #3 LEVEL 3 SITE PLAN 1st Review

The following are the review comments and corrections for the above referenced plan. Comments are not final until 5:00 pm on the published due date and may be subject to change prior to that time:

PLEASE NOTE: Departments that approve this case may not include a "No Comments" in this document. If you do not see comments for a particular department, please check the Approvals in Land Development Office on-line. If the approval has not been given, then comments are still pending.

RE-REVIEW FEES:

The initial submittal fee is valid for the first three consecutive review submittals. Comments generated for any reviews submitted after the 3rd review (2nd re-review) will incur re-review fees in the amount of half the original submittal fee, plus 4% technology surcharges.

Re-review fee:

Re-submittal deadline: 8/20/2015

PLANNING

Nia Rodgers 560-4137 ext 28234

5/22/2015

- 1. Add the planning department case number D1500101 above the approval stamping area, per the requirements of the site plan checklist.
 - **RESPONSE: Planning department case number has been added on G-001.**
- 2. Per the requirements of the site plan checklist, place this note in the Special Conditions of Approval Box: Owner/developer shall notify the Durham City County Planning Department Site Compliance staff at the completion of construction and landscaping to request an inspection prior to use of the facility.
 - RESPONSE: Note has been added on G-001.
- 3. Show the dimension of the new generator from the existing building per the requirements of the site plan checklist.
 - RESPONSE: New Generator has been identified and dimensioned on C-201. Generator is 12' from edge of building.
- 4. Per UDO section 8.3.1.B.3, No tree coverage is required in non-residential districts in the urban tier, please revise the required and proposed tree coverage shown in the site data table on the cover to "N/A".
 - RESPONSE: Site Data Table has been updated to remove tree coverage requirements on G-001.
- Enlarge the notes on the tree protection detail, shown on sheet C-401 so that they are legible.
 RESPONSE: Standard tree protection detail has been scaled up so that notes are legible on C-401.

CITY ENGINEERING

NAME HERE, Engineering Development Review 560-4326

[Date of comments]

TRANSPORTATION

Bill Judge, P.E. 560-4366 ext. 36420

5/22/2015

1. No comments. Approved.

CITY STORMWATER

NAME HERE, Stormwater Development Review 560-4326

May 22, 2015

TO: Nia Rodgers, Planning Department

FROM: Jennifer Buzun, PE, Stormwater Services

Email: jennifer.buzun@durhamnc.gov

SUBJECT: Duke University Central Generation Plant #3 - Review #1

Case # D1500101 Case History:

PIN: 0811-05-69-9253

Address: 2100 Duke University Road (Wannamaker Drive)

Watershed Protection Overlay	None	
Stormwater Regulatory Basin	Jordan Lake	
Cumulative Disturbed Area Since Baseline Date	0.43 acres for this project, but Duke as a whole is over the disturbance threshold	
Pollutant Requirements Applicable?	Yes	
Hydrologic Unit	Sandy Creel	k, HUC12 030300020601
Nutrient Loading Calculations	Provided electronically – See JFLSAT	
Offsite Nutrient Reductions	Provided electronically – See Nutrient	
	Reporting Form	
BMPs Proposed	None	
Required Treatment for the Project	N and P removal	
Put SW Condition on CO Signoff (Non-Single Family Residenti	al)?	Not needed

The Stormwater Services Division has reviewed the subject site plan and has the following comments:

1. Please note that the Soils Survey map copy must be from the print version of the Durham County Soil Survey; digital representations alone, such as those from the Web Soil Survey, are not acceptable because they do not show streams.

RESPONSE: Print version has replaced Digital version and streams are showing.

- 2. It appears from City aerial photography that Chiller Plant #1 was built between 1999 and 2002, and that further changes occurred between 2002 and 2005.
 - a. Why does the 2- and 10-year Site Plan Tracking Table for Sub-Basin 28 not show these changes? Was the site plan for the chiller plant first submitted prior to 2- and 10-year peak flow Baseline Date of 4/23/1997?

RESPONSE: The Duke SIA has been revised to include the additional BUA in sub-basin 28/28A that was not on the original site plan for the Chiller Plant. The delineation of the additional 0.13 ac. of impervious along with the Duke SIA updates are described in the revised SIA sheets and letter from McAdams.

- b. For nutrients, when using the ordinance Section 70-740(c) compliance alternative, the pre-development load in the Jordan/Falls Lake Stormwater Accounting Tool (JFLSAT) must be calculated as of the Jordan Lake applicable baseline date of 12/31/2001, not current land uses. A project can be considered existing as of this Baseline Date if the site plan was first accepted for review before that date.
 - RESPONSE: The additional BUA is included in the project boundary. The Jordan Falls spreadsheets have been updated to include this additional BUA. The Water Quality Tracking spreadsheet has also been updated.
- 3. Please provide pre- and post-development land use maps for the nutrient calculations, to scale no smaller than 1 inch = 100 feet. The maps shall show the map scale, north arrow, and are to have the different land uses indicated in the JFLSAT either hatched or shaded with land use coding indicated in a legend on the maps. Please ensure <u>all</u> land uses are shown in the legend. Also, please ensure the area in SF associated with each land use is noted on the exhibit. The pre- and post-development maps provided could be altered just slightly to fulfill this need. RESPONSE: The pre- and post- development maps have been altered to show land use as required. Note, the pre-development map is not showing the existing condition land use areas that are present at the site now; it is showing land use areas from the original site plan from 2001. This was done to match the JFLSAT so that the impervious areas added in 2005 are now accounted for in the proposed land use areas. Since the original site plan from 2001 is now being used as the baseline to compare to, those land use areas are shown on the predevelopment map.
- 4. I am curious as to why the open space in the post-development scenario in the JFLSAT is being classified as "Unmanaged (pasture)" rather than "INDUSTRIAL Open/Landscaped". There is a higher nutrient loading associated with this use, and all the other uses on site are classified as "INDUSTRIAL".
 - RESPONSE: We have updated the Jordan Falls spreadsheet to show the open area as "Industrial Open/Landscape".
- 5. The version of the Nutrient Reporting Form that was used was not the most current. Please use the version posted on our website at http://durhamnc.gov/ich/op/pwd/storm/Pages/SWDevReview.aspx . Use of the current version
 - will change the results.
 - **RESPONSE: Updated Form has been used.**
- 6. Please remove the Section V Peak Discharge Flow Calculations material. All 1-, 2-, and 10-year peak flow modeling for all Duke projects is done by McAdams. This is already addressed in the Section III Stormwater Impact Analysis material.
 - RESPONSE: Section V Peak Discharge Flow Calculations have been removed.
- 7. Similarly, please remove the Tc flow paths from the pre- and post-development maps. **RESPONSE:** Tc flow paths have been removed.
- 8. On the Site Utility Plan, please indicate where the wall drain discharges to. I believe we talked about this at a meeting and the wall drain is essentially like a weep hole that releases water to the pavement, whereupon it just sheet flows across the pavement. Please indicate this on the drawing.
 - RESPONSE: Drainage exits through the wall through weep holes and sheet flows across the pavement. Weep hole locations have been called out on C-201.
- 9. Graveled or paved areas that have supported vehicles or other weight are typically compacted down into the subgrade and are considered impervious. If this area is being included in the post-development "non-impervious" surface area, merely removing the gravel and putting sod on top will not render this area pervious. Please mark the boundaries of the area to be converted from

impervious to pervious surface and include the following note:

"The proper procedure for compacted soil remediation is as follows.

- a. Remove all impervious surfaces from the subject area.
- b. Till the area to a depth of 12" below the top of compacted subgrade.
- c. Suitable rates and types of soil amendments should be determined through soil tests. Limestone and fertilizer should be applied uniformly during seedbed preparation and mixed well with the top 4 to 6 inches of soil."

RESPONSE: The above notes have been added to the site plan (C-202) and called out in plan where applicable. The area has been outlined with a dashed line in plan and called out and added to the legend.

COUNTY SOIL & EROSION CONTROL

Chris Roberts 560-0739

5/26/2015

- Erosion Control Group
 - General Comment: This project meets the Durham City/County Erosion Control UDO for site plan review.
- Open Space Group
 - 1. General Comment: This project meets the Durham City/County UDO for Open Space Requirements.

CITY FIRE Tom Darling 560-1199

5/27/15 First Review

Site plan needs to include all required elements of Section 3406.5.1 of the NC Fire Code pertaining to the bulk transfer of liquids between the tank vehicle and storage tank.

RESPONSE: The following changes have been made to address 3406.5.1:

- Called out location of mobile fueling to clarify that it is further than 15' from any buildings on C-202
- No weather canopy will be provided. No mechanical ventilation will be required; natural ventilation is effective for the application.
- Called out "No Smoking Within 25 Feet of Tank" signage on C-202.
- Detailed what provisions have been provided for spill control on C-201. Spill containment area is called out in plan, and Note 2 has been added detailing requirements.
- A 5' tall fence around the fueling area has not been provided. Per 3406.5.1.18 Exception: no fence is necessary due to the site's isolation and natural barriers from the public.

COUNTY STORMWATER

Chris Roberts 560-0739

5/26/2015

- Stormwater Group
 - 1. General Comment: This project will be reviewed by the City of Durham's Stormwater Group.

COUNTY FIRE MARSHAL

Craig Zglinski 560-0662

[Date of comments]

SOLID WASTE

Mike Simpson 560-4186 ext. 32248

[5/22/15] Approved.

NC DOT 919-220-4750

[Date of comments]

INSPECTIONS

Carlos Diaz 560-4144 ext. 26287

5/25/15; 1st review; D1500101 – Duke University Central Generation Plant #3

1) Please add the following note to the site plan: "The SITE will be fully compliant with the North Carolina Accessibility Codes (ANSI 117.1 -2009 and Chapter 11 of the NCBC) unless and except in areas where an approved statement from a site engineer, surveyor or architect verifies that site conditions exist where the topography of the site is extreme and only alternate methods of compliance are possible." (This is a standard note which must be on all site plans, regardless of site plan scope)

RESPONSE: Note has been added to the site plan. See sheets C-201 and C-202. Note has also been added to G-001 in the General Notes and Conditions of Approval section.

URBAN FORESTRY

Alex Johnson 560-4197 ext 21275

[Date of comments]

COUNTY UTILITY DIVISION

Ted Credle 560-9039

[Date of comments]

WATER MANAGEMENT

Crystal Penton 560-4381 ext. 35284

5/11/2015 - Approved

GIS/ADDRESSING

Lenora Melton 560-4122 ext 33233

[Date of comments]

PARKS & RECREATION

Rosetta Radtke 560-4355 ext. 27208

[Date of comments]

COUNTY OPEN SPACE & REAL ESTATE

Jane Korest 560-7955

[Date of comments]

ADVISORY COMMENTS

Please note that comments from advisory boards and departments

are suggestions, except when code-based.

POLICE			
[Date of comments]			
BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE		bpac.devrev@durhamnc.gov	
[Date of comments]			
DOST	Helen Youngble	Helen Youngblood/Annette Montgomery 560-4137 ext. 28245	
[Date of comments]			

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Re-Submittal of Corrected Plans:

- Plans submitted for subsequent reviews should be returned to the Planning Department for distribution. Corrected plans must include the issued comments with a written response indicating how and where the comment is addressed on the revised plans.
- Revised plans should be highlighted or "clouded" to clearly distinguish corrections or changes
 made, even when the changes were not directly in response to the corrections. Plans without the
 highlighted changes on the plan and comments without written response for each comment will
 not be accepted for re-review.
- 3. Please provide one paper copy for each department with outstanding comments to the Planning Department except as noted below. Paper copies should be **folded** and banded with a copy of the responses. Only one CD (*Compact Disc*) is required for all departments accepting electronic copies. Electronic copies should be provided on a CD as a single file in PDF format. The CD should also include a PDF copy of comments with written responses.
 - Note: The following departments accept electronic plans: City Fire Marshal, Parks and Recreation, Urban Forestry, Planning Design Compliance, GIS/Addressing, Planning Commission, Police, DOST, Bike/Ped, Soil and Water.

Resubmittal Deadlines:

1. The Unified Development Ordinance requires that plans be returned within 90 days of the last comments issued. Plans submitted to address a Notice of Violation (NOV) shall be returned within 30 days of the last comments issued. If not submitted within this time period, the case will be considered withdrawn and the applicant must resubmit a new application package for review.

2. Please contact the Planning Department case planner (indicated above) with any questions about the submittal and review process.

Final Plan Approval:

When all comments have been addressed and approved by all departments, please provide at least six copies of the corrected plans to the case planner for approval stamp and signature.











